

### REMARKS

This responds to the Final Office Action mailed on December 7, 2004.

Claims 1, 2, 10, 12, 15 and 22 are amended, claim 20 is canceled, claims 23-26 are new; as a result, claims 1-19 and 21-26 are now pending in this application.

#### §102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Perkowski (U.S. 5,950,173).

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-22 should not be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for the reason that Perkowski does not disclose each and every limitation of the independent claims of their present application.

To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference."

Claim 10, for example, includes the following limitation:

translating the attribute-value pair to a canonical attribute-value pair responsive to identifying the attribute-value pair in a list that is associated with the canonical attribute-value pair

The Final Office Action contends that the above limitation is anticipated by the following quote from Perkowski:

Once an "initial" IPI Registrant Database has been constructed using any one or more of the four database construction techniques described hereinabove, manufacturers registered therewith can be periodically contacted using Web-based electronic document (i.e. message) transfer techniques in order to request updating and confirmation of the UPC/URL listings contained within the database of the IPI subsystem of the present invention (emphasis added).

Col. 25, lines 47-54.

The above quote from Perkowski describes updating listings within the IPI Registrant Database. The Final Office Action states, "the collected data is transformed from raw data into one of the tables of FIGS. 4A1, 4A2 and 4B. A table is a canonical form of data (Final Office Action, page 2).

Claim 1 requires translating an attribute-value pair to a canonical attribute-value pair responsive to identifying the attribute-value pair in a list that is associated with the canonical attribute-value pair. Merely for example, the attribute-value pair, "screen\_size = xga", may be translated to the canonical attribute-value pair, "display\_res = 1024x768", responsive to identifying "screen\_size = xga" in a list that is associated with the canonical attribute-value pair, "display\_res = 1024x768," (Example Embodiment, Application, page 14).

In contrast to the above quoted limitation of claim 10, the quote from Perkowski does not describe translating; but rather, updating (e.g., an old URL with a new URL). Clearly, the new URL is never "translated" or "change[d] from one form...to another" <sup>1</sup>, but rather is updated or written into the IPI Registrant Database in original form. In addition, the previous URL cannot be said to be translated or "express[ed] in another

---

<sup>1</sup> Websters II New College Dictionary, Houghton Mifflin Company (1999).

language, while systematically retaining the original sense”<sup>2</sup>, because the original sense is destroyed when it is overwritten or updated. Moreover, the new URL cannot be a translation of the old URL because in no way does the new URL systematically retain the original sense of the old URL. Indeed, the above quote explicitly describes updating and not translating, much less translating an attribute-pair, much less translating the attribute-value pair responsive to identifying the attribute-value pair in a list that is associated with the canonical attribute-value pair. Perkowski therefore cannot be said to anticipate the above quoted limitations because Perkowski describes updating listings in an IPI Registrant Database and claim 10 requires translating an attribute-value pair into a canonical attribute-value pair responsive to identifying the attribute-value pair in a list that is associated with the canonical attribute-value pair.

In summary, Perkowski does not disclose each and every limitation of claim 10, as required to support a rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Independent claims 1, 12, 23, 24, 25 and 26 include limitations corresponding substantially to the above-discussed limitation of claim 10. Accordingly, Applicants request that the above remarks and amendments contained herein also be considered when examining these other independent claims for allow ability.

As dependent claims are deemed to include all limitation of claims from which they depend, the rejection of claims 2-9, 11, 13-19 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is also addressed by the above remarks, and the amendments contained herein.

Claim 22 includes the following limitation:

---

<sup>2</sup> Id. (an alternate definition).

creating a record search file from said records in said database, wherein token integers for each parameter type from said database are arranged sequentially adjacent to each other in said record search file;

The Final Office Action contends that the above limitation of claim 22 is anticipated by the following Figure in Perkowski:

IP/SN	REGISTRANT'S NAME	PRODUCT DESCRIPTION	UNIFORM RESOURCE LOCATOR (URL)	TRADE/SERVICE MARKS	E-MAIL ADDRESS	STATUS
7/18908/17674/0	APPLE COMPUTER, INC. CUPERTINO, CALIF.	POWER MAC. 7800/120 PERSONAL COMPUTER	http://www.-----/	POWER MAC.		
0/373/100/6	PROCTOR & GAMBLE	TOOTH PASTE	http://www.-----/	CREST		
3/12547/68404/0	WARNER WELCOME	ACID REDUCER	http://www.-----/	ZANTAC, ZANTAC 75		
0/00005/17843/4	KODAK, INC.	FILM PROCESSING	http://www.-----/	KODAK		
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮
0/27242/51057/9	SONY, INC.	PERSONAL COMPUTER	http://www.sony.com/pc	SONY		

FIG 4A1

Perkowski discloses the following:

As shown in FIG. 4A1, the ... IPI Registrant Database... comprises ... an IPN Information Field for storing information (e.g. numeric or alphanumeric string) representative of the Universal Product Number (e.g. twelve-digit UPC Version A number or eight-digit UPC Version E number) assigned to the consumer product.

Claim 22 requires creating a record search file from records in a database where token integers for each parameter type in the database are arranged sequentially adjacent to each other in the search file. Merely for example, a record search file may be created from a database that includes multiple records with each record including a color token integer and a cost token integer. Continuing with the example, the database may be read and the token integers reorganized such that the color token integers from each record in the database are sequentially adjacent in the search file and the cost token integers from each record in the database are sequentially adjacent in the search file.

In contrast to the above quoted limitation of claim 22, the aquote from Perkowski does not describe creating a record search file much less creating a record search file from records in a database much less creating a record search file where token integers for each parameter type in the database are arranged sequentially adjacent to each other in the record search file. The above quote from Perkowski simply describes an IPI registrant database. Perkowski therefore cannot be said to anticipate the above quoted limitations because claim 22 requires creating a record search file from records in a database.

Serial Number: 09/730,538

Filing Date: December 7, 2000

Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR COLLECTING, ASSOCIATING, NORMALIZING AND PRESENTING PRODUCT AND  
VENDOR INFORMATION ON A DISTRIBUTED NETWORK

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney 408-846-8871 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

KERRY CLENDINNING ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
408-846-8871

Date 3/7/2005

By Mark R. Vatuone

Mark R. Vatuone  
Reg. No. 53,719

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this \_\_\_\_ day of March, 2005.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature